

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 16 and 17 are pending and rejected in this application.

Responsive to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-7, 9-14, 16 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,367,005 (Douty et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,203,397 (Bandyopadhyay) and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 4,280,746 (Ignatowicz), Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection and submit that claims 1-7, 9-14, 16 and 17 are in condition for allowance.

Douty, et al. disclose a strain relief cover on cable 10 that terminates at cable 12. Each cover member 14 and 16 includes an inwardly bowed, conductor gripping portion 22 having a plurality of inwardly directed integral teeth 24 thereon. The shape of the teeth is of little consequence to the functionality of the invention (column 2, lines 21-37). The Examiner has indicated that teeth 24 have a chiseled point even though Fig. 1 shows a trapezoidal cross section, which is also reflected in the Examiner's sketch.

Bandyopadhyay discloses a heating assembly for a die casting machine. Conductors 16 can be surrounded by a sleeve of fiberglass, a portion of which is shown at 20 in the Fig. (column 5, lines 3-5).

Ignatowicz discloses a connector arranged to permanently lock onto a cable including tabs 35 and 49, which exert forces perpendicularly to the surface of cable 50 with which they are in contact as shown in Figs. 1-5. Tabs 35 and 49 bite into and securely clasp cable 50 thereby preventing cable 50 from pulling out of the connector and thereby provides strain relief (column 5, lines 30-46).

In contrast, claim 1, recites in part:

said pointed projections engage said fiberglass sleeve and separate at least a portion of said plurality of electrical conductors between said pointed projections.

(Emphasis Added) Applicants submit that such an invention is neither taught, disclosed nor

suggested by Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay and Ignatowicz or any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, and includes distinct advantages thereover.

Douty et al. and Ignatowicz each illustrate compressive forces being used on electrical conductors. Please see Fig. 5 in Douty et al. and Fig. 2 in Ignatowicz. Bandyopadhyay teaches a fiberglass sleeve surrounding conductors. In contrast, Applicant's invention includes pointed projections which engage the fiberglass sleeve and then additionally separate electrical conductors between the pointed projections. Douty et al. shows electrical conductors being compressed together and not separated. Ignatowicz only shows a compressive force being used on an outside sleeve of a plurality of electrical conductors. In both cases, electrical conductors are only in a more compressed situation, being closer together than without the compressive forces being applied. Therefore, Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay, Ignatowicz and any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest pointed projections engaging the fiberglass sleeve and separating at least a portion of the plurality of electrical conductors between the pointed projections, as recited in claim 1.

An advantage of Applicants' invention is that the pointed projections engage the fiberglass sleeve by engaging it and the projections additionally separate individual electrical conductors. Additionally, the chisel points of the projections are oriented substantially parallel with the direction of the electrical conductors thereby aiding in the separation without causing a compressive force on the electrical conductors. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1, and claims 2-7 depending therefrom, are in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

In further contrast claim 9, recites in part:

said pointed projections engage said fiberglass sleeve and separate at least a portion of said plurality of electrical conductors between said pointed projections.

(Emphasis Added) Applicants submit that such an invention is neither taught, disclosed nor

suggested by Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay and Ignatowicz or any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, and includes distinct advantages thereover.

Douty et al. and Ignatowicz each illustrate compressive forces being used on electrical conductors. Please see Fig. 5 in Douty et al. and Fig. 2 in Ignatowicz. Bandyopadhyay teaches a fiberglass sleeve surrounding conductors. In contrast, Applicant's invention includes pointed projections which engage the fiberglass sleeve and then additionally separate electrical conductors between the pointed projections. Douty et al. shows electrical conductors being compressed together and not separated. Ignatowicz only shows a compressive force being used on an outside sleeve of a plurality of electrical conductors. In both cases, electrical conductors are only in a more compressed situation, being closer together than without the compressive forces being applied. Therefore, Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay, Ignatowicz and any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest pointed projections engaging the fiberglass sleeve and separating at least a portion of the plurality of electrical conductors between the pointed projections, as recited in claim 9.

An advantage of Applicants' invention is that the pointed projections engage the fiberglass sleeve by engaging it and the projections additionally separate individual electrical conductors. Additionally, the chisel points of the projections are oriented substantially parallel with the direction of the electrical conductors thereby aiding in the separation without causing a compressive force on the electrical conductors. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 9, and claims 10-14 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

In still further contrast, claim 16 recites in part:

gripping said fiberglass sleeve with said projections; and
separating at least a portion of said electrical conductors with said projections.

(Emphasis Added) Applicants submit that such an invention is neither taught, disclosed nor suggested by Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay and Ignatowicz or any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, and includes distinct advantages thereover.

Douty et al. and Ignatowicz each illustrate compressive forces being used on electrical conductors. Please see Fig. 5 in Douty et al. and Fig. 2 in Ignatowicz. Bandyopadhyay teaches a fiberglass sleeve surrounding conductors. In contrast, Applicant's invention includes pointed projections which engage the fiberglass sleeve and then additionally separate electrical conductors between the pointed projections. Douty et al. shows electrical conductors being compressed together and not separated. Ignatowicz only shows a compressive force being used on an outside sleeve of a plurality of electrical conductors. In both cases, electrical conductors are only in a more compressed situation, being closer together than without the compressive forces being applied. Therefore, Douty et al., Bandyopadhyay, Ignatowicz and any of the other cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the steps of gripping the fiberglass sleeve with the projections and separating at least a portion of the electrical conductors with the projections, as recited in claim 16.

An advantage of Applicants' invention is that the pointed projections engage the fiberglass sleeve by engaging it and the projections additionally separate individual electrical conductors. Additionally, the chisel points of the projections are oriented substantially parallel with the direction of the electrical conductors thereby aiding in the separation without causing a compressive force on the electrical conductors. For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 16, and claim 17 depending therefrom, are now in condition for allowance, which is hereby respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that no combination of the cited references teaches, discloses or suggests the subject matter of the amended claims. The pending claims are

therefore in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all rejections and allowance of the claims.

In the event Applicants have overlooked the need for an extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants hereby conditionally petition therefor and authorizes that any charges be made to Deposit Account No. 20-0095, TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.

Should any question concerning any of the foregoing arise, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (260) 897-3400.

Respectfully submitted,

Todd T. Taylor
Registration No. 36,945

Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on: July 21, 2004.

Todd T. Taylor, Reg. No. 36,945

Name of Registered Representative

Signature

July 21, 2004

Date

TTT6/ge

TAYLOR & AUST, P.C.
142 S. Main Street
P.O. Box 560
Avilla, IN 46710
Telephone: 260-897-3400
Facsimile: 260-897-9300

Enc.: Return postcard